

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/043,439	LECTION ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean Reilly	2153	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sean Reilly (Examiner). (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Rob Showalter (Applicant's Representative). (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 2, 4, 22 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that each limitation in the claims must be given weight, including structure limitations in method claims, in view of at least *In re Pleuddemann* (CA FC) 15 USPQ2d 1738, *Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.* 405 F.3d 1326, 1329, 74 USPQ2d 1481, 1483 (Fed. Cir. 2005), and *Minton v. Nat'l Ass'n of Securities Dealers, Inc.* 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ 2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Examiner agreed. Accordingly the structure limitations are given weight and the amendments as filed on July 31, 2006 place the case in condition for allowance. .